THE MIZAN NEWSLETTER

No.4 April 1959

---

The Mizan Newsletter aims at giving an objective and balanced account of current Soviet writings on the Middle East.

---

## SOVIET WRITING ON SAUDI ARABIA

Soviet writers make much of the fact that the Soviet Union was the first country to recognize King Sa'ud's assumption of rule over the Hijaz, after its conquest in 1926. It is claimed that a further proof of Soviet friendship for Saudi Arabia - Soviet "moral support" as one writer calls it - was the Amir Faysal's visit to Moscow in 1932 at the head of an official Government delegation. Soviet writers have in general continued to follow the development of Saudi Arabia with interest and sympathy, and they deplore the present absence of Saudi-Soviet diplomatic relations. (A Soviet mission remained in Jiddah until 1938-Ed.) A notable recent work on Saudi Arabia is I.P.Belyayev's AMERICAN IMPERIALISM IN SAUDI ARABIA, which is largely a detailed account of the effects of oil industry development on the country's economic, social and political life.

The Monarchy and the Wahhabi Movement The current Soviet assessment of the original Wahhabi State, the creation of Ibn Sa'ud, is a favourable one. Belyayev (op. cit.) says: "Ibn Sa'ud's aim, the creation of a strong, centralized feudal State, accorded with the aspirations to unity and national independence shared by the disunited population of the emirates and tribes of Arabia". Elsewhere Belyayev speaks of the Wahhabis and their Imam as constituting Saudi Arabia's "national liberation movement" in the years following the first world war, when "the Great October socialist revolution in Russia awakened the oppressed peoples of the East". Ibn Sa'ud is praised as the opponent, first of the Turks, and then of the British, who "surrounded him with hostile States". (The Great Soviet Encyclopaedia, 1955, drew a different picture: it said that Saudi Arabia

was "under strong British influence" until the mid-1930s, and that Wahhabism "is used by the imperialists and the Wahhabi feudalists as a reactionary ideology protecting the colonial-feudal regime and directed against the national liberation struggle in Arabia and against progressive democratic ideas.")

In THE COUNTRIES OF ARABIA AND COLONIALISM (1956) Ye. Primakov speaks with enthusiasm of the Wahhabis' unifying mission in Arabia, and of the encouragement which they gave, "long before the coming of the Western colonizers", to the development of Arabia's agriculture and trade. A.I.Pershits, an authority on the peoples of the Arabian peninsula, wrote (1955) with approval of Wahhabism's opposition both to pagan survivals and to excessive Muslim ritual. Writing in 1958, however, Pershits spoke of Wahhabism, with its strict code of social and personal behaviour, as itself being influenced by "the fresh breeze of the progressive movements in the Arab countries" in the direction of social awakening. Belyayev similarly analyses the institution of the ikhwan in the light of modern conditions: "The military-feudal system of the ikhwan, having played its positive role in the period of the formation of the centralized feudal Wahhabi State, has in our days become a brake on the economic and political development of Saudi Arabia".

The present Saudi monarchy and royal family is the object at least of indirect criticism. Belyayev says that the King and members of the royal family own the best agricultural lands. Expenditure on the Court and the ruling dynasty he represents as excessive.

Oil and the U.S.A. In Soviet writings on Saudi Arabia the subject which receives most attention is U.S. exploitation of Saudi Arabia's oil resources. It is maintained that the various oil concession agreements are inequitable and were forced upon the Saudi Government at times of financial stringency. It is admitted that ARAMCO does in fact pay large sums to the Saudi Government in concessionary payments and as its share of profits; but, Belyayev estimates, during 1939-1945 Saudi Arabia was receiving only 30 per cent of the sale price of its oil; during these years it received about 1,300 million dollars from ARAMCO, whereas "with independent production and sale of this oil on the world capitalist market Saudi Arabia would have received a gross profit of 4,575 million dollars". Thus the company "pays to the King of Saudi Arabia only part of what by rights belongs to the Saudi people". Belyayev relates how the Saudi Government has pressed for a higher share of profits, for the surrender of territorial concessions, for Saudi participation in the company, and, more recently, for ARAMCO's conversion into a Saudi company. Reviewing Belyayev's book in INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS of September 1958, Y. Potemkin says that the latest Saudi demand for revision of the concession agreements "to a certain extent reflects the anti-imperialist current in the country".

The assertion is frequently made by Soviet writers that the oil revenues, if they went to their rightful beneficiaries, could liquidate poverty. Primakov (op. cit.) says that, if the Arabs had fully enjoyed the profits of their oil, they could have built oil refineries such as the ARAMCO refinery at Ras Tanura for themselves, not to mention pipelines. In NEW TIMES No.39 of September 1957 Y. Vasilyev noted that more and more Middle East countries were planning national oil companies and undertakings of their own; the growing "battle to end the oil stranglehold" was "an integral part of the battle against the Baghdad Pact and the Eisenhower doctrine".

Belyayev alleges that U.S. capital maintains a stranglehold on the entire economy of Saudi Arabia; that it only develops such industries and concerns as will either benefit ARAMCO or assist U.S. strategic plans; that exchange rates are manipulated to suit U.S. interests; that agriculture is neglected, except for model farms built to serve ARAMCO; and that, so far from effecting a capitalist transformation of the economy of Saudi Arabia, U.S. capital has assisted local feudal elements to strengthen their grip on the economy. ARAMCO itself is accused of "brutal exploitation" of Saudi workers, "forced to work" for the company by their shaykhs; employment of child labour; grossly discriminatory rates of pay for Saudi employees as compared with U.S. staff; segregation and differential treatment of workers of different nationalities, amounting to racial discrimination; the training of specially selected workers in the U.S.A., who are used as "agents" on their return; interference in schools; and refusal to give holidays for the pilgrimage or for religious festivals.

Workers' and Nationalist Movements Belyayev traces the growth in Saudi Arabia of a proletariat, a middle class and a "national intelligentsia" - all of which, he says, were non-existent at the end of the 1920s. In 1945, he says, ARAMCO's Saudi workers first came forward in defence of their interests; they stopped work and demanded an improvement of working conditions and increased pay. Belyayev goes on to give an account of the strikes of 1953 and 1956. He observes that through their action the workers obtained from ARAMCO and from the Government some concessions and improvements. He accuses the Saudi authorities of brutality in the suppression of the strikes. The workers' demands, he says, were political as well as economic; they included guaranteeing the rights of trade unions and official recognition of the workers' committee; the granting of a Constitution and the formation of political parties and national organizations; free elections to a parliament, with the participation of the widest masses of the people; freedom of the press; the release of all political prisoners; and economic and cultural links with all states fighting against imperialism.

The growth of national and political consciousness in Saudi Arabia since the war, says Belyayev, found expression in the formation of two illegal political parties, the Reform Party, and the more radical Liberal Party. Saudi Arabia was represented at a conference of peace defenders in Beirut in December 1955. The national liberation movement of Saudi Arabia, Belyayev affirms, is now part of the general struggle of the Arab peoples for their rights, for full national independence and for peace, and this is seriously influencing the internal and foreign policies of the Saudi Government.

In a chapter entitled "Saudi Arabia in the Military Plans of the U.S.A." Belyayev examines Saudi Arabia's role in U.S. strategy, both as affording an air base "1,000 miles from the southern frontiers of the Soviet Union", and as a fuel supply base for the NATO armies. Belyayev notes that "liquidation of the American atomic base in Dahran" was one of the demands of Saudi workers who went on strike in Dahran, Dammam and elsewhere in June 1956.

Saudi Arabia's Foreign Policy In THE ARABS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE (1957) Z.I. Levin says that "like the majority of other Arab States, Saudi Arabia decisively rejects all attempts to draw her into aggressive military blocs". Levin and other writers comment favourably on the Saudi Government's support for the Bandung Conference declaration, and also on its attitude to the Eisenhower doctrine. King Sa'ud's visit to the U.S.A. in January-February 1957, it is remarked, was not followed by Saudi Arabia's adherence to the Eisenhower doctrine but by its reaffirmation, together with other Arab States, of devotion to the principles of positive neutrality; and there was no mention of the Eisenhower doctrine in the communique issued after Richards' talks with King Sa'ud in April 1957. Saudi Arabia's opposition to the Baghdad Pact, together with Egypt and Syria, is favourably noted.

In INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS No.3 of 1958 K. Ivanov notes that "certain changes" in Saudi Arabia's foreign policy took place in 1957, in a direction contrary to closer collaboration with Egypt and Syria. NEW TIMES No.28 of 1958 said that "this spring the aged King Sa'ud transferred to Prince Faysal full supervision of economic, financial, home and foreign policy". In INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS No.6 of 1958 S. Danilov expressed misgivings about the results for Saudi foreign policy of the increased powers now vested in the Amir Faysal, who was known to hold different views from King Sa'ud on Saudi Arabia's policy towards the other Arab States, towards the West and towards the socialist countries. The Amir Faysal, Danilov remarked, had reaffirmed his country's belief in "positive neutrality", but his understanding of the term was evidently not the usual one, if he preferred "to have close and friendly relations mainly with the United States". Saudi Arabia, said Danilov, refrained from direct

diplomatic relations with the socialist countries, although it must realize that "the greatest progress in strengthening national independence and State sovereignty has been made by those countries which maintain normal friendly relations with these countries, including the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China".

The more critical tone of Soviet writing on the latest phase of Saudi Arabian policy is evident. Nevertheless, the Saudi Government appears still to be viewed rather as a victim of American designs than as an executant of them.

## ARAB RIVALRIES: THE SOVIET VIEW

Soviet accounts of the Mosul rising of 8th-9th March presented it as a revolt engineered by reactionary forces acting with support from outside Iraq. The UAR was not mentioned by name in this connection; it was suggested that the origin of the revolt could be found in the U.S.A's new bilateral agreements with Baghdad Pact countries. The solidarity of the Iraqi people and Government in facing the revolt was particularly emphasized. The expulsion of Egyptian Embassy staff from Baghdad was reported without comment.

Abd an-Nasir's speech of 11th March in Damascus, attacking the communists and "communist terrorism which today prevails against Arab nationalism and Arab nationalists in Baghdad", evoked no immediate Soviet comment. In further speeches on 12th, 13th 14th and 15th March Abd an-Nasir denounced Arab Communists as agents of a foreign power, condemned communist "atheism", accused the Iraqi Premier of subservience to the communists, and said that in Iraq communism was "eliminating patriotism and nationalism in the name of a false democracy".

Khrushchev on Arab nationalism On 16th March, at a Kremlin reception for the Iraqi economic delegation, Khrushchev reviewed the whole question of relations between Iraq and the UAR and between those two countries and the USSR. On Iraqi-UAR relations, he said that Abd an-Nasir's attitude to the Iraqi Republic had changed; he now wanted to make Iraq a part of the UAR; but the union of two countries could not be enforced against the will of their peoples. Of Abd an-Nasir's attacks on communism, Khrushchev said that the accusations made were neither new nor true; they could only benefit the imperialists. On Soviet-UAR relations, Khrushchev said he believed that these would remain unaltered; but, he insisted, the "democratic demands of the peoples" must receive more attention. He went on to speak of Arab nationalism:

"It is said that Arab nationalism supposedly stands outside the interests of separate Arab States, and outside the interests of different classes of the population of Arab countries. Undoubtedly the interests of the majority of Arabs are indivisible in the struggle against the colonial yoke. But after a country has freed itself from foreign domination the interests of the people cannot be ignored. For the interests of all the Arabs cannot coincide. Therefor attempts under the flag of nationalism to ignore the interests of separate classes of the population and the interests of the working people are futile."

Developments in Iraq, said Khrushchev, had nothing in common with socialism, but nevertheless progressive reforms were being effected and "a more advanced system is being established there than in the neighbouring countries of the Arab East". The new Soviet-Iraqi agreement on economic and technical co-operation would help to further the progressive economic aims of the young Republic. (For the text of Khrushchev's speech, see Appendix A.)

UAR and Soviet Interpretations of Khrushchev's Speech In the UAR Khrushchev's speech was represented as a full-scale attack on Arab nationalism. Hitherto, said a UAR commentator, Moscow had supported Abd an-Nasir and the Arabs in the struggle against Western imperialism; but now that the West had been expelled from the Arab area, Moscow had started "the new stage in its plan for dominating the Arab nation" - Arab nationalists and neutralists were to be opposed, and support was to be transferred to the communists and their followers.

In a PRAVDA dispatch from Cairo on 18th March Kondrashov said that Abd an-Nasir had misinterpreted Khrushchev's speech; although the speech was "dictated by concern for the preservation and strengthening of the unity of the Arab countries in the struggle against imperialism", Abd an-Nasir had represented it as an attempt to set one part of the UAR's population against another. Khrushchev's expressions of hope for the improvement of UAR-Iraqi relations, said Kondrashov, had been omitted in Cairo press versions of the speech.

In a speech in Damascus on 22nd March, Abd an-Nasir said that Egypt had "fought alone" against Israel, Britain and France from 29th October to 6th November 1956 without "any sign of assistance from any foreign State, including the Soviet Union". The Soviet reply to this claim came in a long PRAVDA article by "Observer" on 30th March.

Abd an-Nasir's assertion, said PRAVDA, was amply disproved by previous statements of his acknowledging the vital importance of the help given to Egypt by the USSR on this and other occasions. PRAVDA went on to

reply to other allegations recently made by Egyptian propaganda against the Soviet Union - notably the slogans of Communist "atheism" ("The Soviet Union treats religious feelings with full understanding and deeply respects the right of any man to profess his religion") and of Communist support for the "fertile crescent" idea ("The Soviet Union has always opposed this reactionary venture, advantageous only to the imperialists"). The PRAVDA article concluded by repeating Khrushchev's assertion that the UAR-Iraqi dispute could only benefit the West, and that Soviet friendship for both the UAR and Iraq remained unaltered.

The Soviet View of Arab Unity The term "Arab nationalism" is infrequently used by Soviet writers, who prefer to speak of the national liberation movement of the Arab people, or of the movement for Arab unity. But "Arab unity" itself bears a special connotation in Soviet writings; it means, specifically, Arab unity against imperialism, and this has been particularly emphasised in recent months.

In an article on the Middle East situation in INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS of January 1959 K. Ivanov upholds the ideal of "genuine anti-imperialist unity" in the Arab world - "a unity which, for objective reasons, is very multiform in its method of struggle and organization, but which is directed against a single and common foe, and prompted by a single purpose". This ideal of unity between anti-imperialist forces Ivanov contrasts with the exploitation of the Arab unity movement by imperialist powers, who, he says, have before now "used the ambitious designs and the pan-Arab verbosity of certain Arab statesmen for their own selfish ends".

In an article on "The Iraqi Republic Today" in NEW TIMES No.8 of 1959 G. Mirskiy remarked that the Iraqi leaders took the correct view of Arab unity; Ibrahim Kubbah, the Iraqi Minister of Economy, had spoken of "closer solidarity" in the struggle against imperialism, and "democratic methods of rapprochement" in the strengthening of Arab ties. Mirskiy observed: "Iraqi progressives resolutely oppose the Arab unity variants that leave out of account the historical features of any one of the Arab countries and are detrimental to their democratic development."

The Working Masses as the Main Political Force Ivanov, in his article quoted above, observed: "The role and importance of the mass of the people in the Arab national movement has increased." Mirskiy, in his NEW TIMES article, said: "The distinctive feature of the present situation in Iraq is the exceptionally high political activity of the masses." The role of the working masses as the basic force of the national movement is now decisively proclaimed by Khrushchev, with his condemnation of "attempts under the flag of nationalism to ignore...the interests of the working people", and his praise of Iraq as being among "those States which take into consideration the interests of their people".

The Iraqi Government's economic and social programme has recently received particular praise in Soviet journals. Articles reviewing Iraq's policy on agrarian reform, oil, education, housing, etc. have appeared in INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS of January and UCHITEL'SKAYA GAZETA of 5th March; and an article devoted solely to agrarian reform in Iraq appeared in SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK of February.

## PERSIAN AND SOVIET VIEWS ON THE 1921 TREATY

At a press conference on 2nd March, according to Tehran radio, the Persian Deputy Foreign Minister Dr. Sadr made the following reference to the 1921 Soviet-Persian Treaty: "Contrary to press reports, this agreement is still valid, but Articles V and VI are obsolete, because they are no longer applicable."

Speaking in the Persian Senate on 4th March the Persian Foreign Minister Ali Asghar Hekmat said, in clarification of Dr. Sadr's statement, that the two articles in question were obsolete because the conditions for which they provided no longer existed. (Article VI gave Russia the right to advance troops into Persia if a third party should use Persian territory as a base of operations against Russia; but an exchange of letters annexed to the treaty made it clear that the specific situation envisaged by this article was the use of Persian territory by Tsarist counter-revolutionary forces or their allies - Ed.) The Persian Foreign Minister read out the 1921 exchange of letters, and also those passages of a Soviet-Persian draft protocol of 1935 which declared that the situation which necessitated Article VI had changed, and that the article was annulled.

On 15th March PRAVDA published an article by S. Golunskiy, corresponding member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, entitled "The clumsy attempts of the Persian Government to avoid their treaty obligations". For nearly 40 years, said Golunskiy, friendly relations between the USSR and Persia had been based on the treaties of 1921 and 1927; but now, in connection with the statements by Sadr and Hekmat, a section of the Persian press had started a campaign about the so-called "invalidity" of Articles V and VI of the 1921 Treaty. It was nonsense for Hekmat to cite in his favour the Soviet letter of 12th December 1921; "this letter clearly confirms the meaning of the articles in question, which forbid preparations on Persian territory for active and armed struggle against Russia or the Soviet Republics allied with her." It was clear, said Golunskiy, that those Persian circles which did not value normal good-neighbourly relations with the USSR were now trying to free their hands for co-operation with the U.S.A. in aggressive plans to make Persia a bridgehead against the USSR and Persia's other peace-loving neighbours.

If the Persian Government regarded Articles V and VI of the 1921 Treaty as an obstacle in the way of such a policy, then it was evident that it was proposing to act contrary to these articles - "that is, against the interests of the state security of the Soviet Union and against the interests of peace in the Near and Middle East".

(Note: Golunskiy's account of the Soviet letter of 12th December 1921 is at variance with the contents of the letter. Soviet readers are perhaps not able to judge this for themselves; the latest Soviet standard handbook on Persia, MODERN IRAN, 1947, publishes the text of the 1921 Treaty but omits the annexed exchange of letters - Ed.)

## SOVIET ANGLE ON THE NEWS

Below are reviewed Soviet newspaper reports on Middle East events published during the period 8th - 31st March. (For reports on the Mosul rising, UAR-Iraqi relations and Soviet-UAR relations, see the second article in this issue.)

The Soviet-Iraqi economic agreement Under the Soviet-Iraqi economic agreement signed on 16th March the Soviet Government will co-operate with the Iraqi Government in carrying out Iraq's national economic development plan in the fields of industry, agriculture and transport; the USSR will give technical assistance in the construction of a number of enterprises of the heavy industry and the machine construction, chemical, food and light industries; and Soviet specialists will carry out survey work for the expansion of the irrigation network, geological prospecting and the planning of certain roads. The USSR will assist in the training of Iraqi specialists. Iraq is granted a credit of 550,000,000 rubles at 2.5 per cent annual interest. Iraq will repay in 12 annual instalments the parts of the credit used for each of the projects in question, beginning a year after the delivery from the USSR of the complete equipment provided for in the corresponding contracts.

Iraqi newspaper articles extolling the agreement were widely quoted in the Soviet press.

The U.S. bilateral agreements with Turkey, Persia and Pakistan On 25th March Soviet newspapers published a long Soviet Government statement denouncing the military agreements with the U.S.A. recently concluded by Turkey, Persia and Pakistan. The statement said: "On the pretext of 'defence' against a mythical threat of aggression these agreements portend still closer ties between Persia, Turkey and Pakistan and the U.S. war

chariot, including the introduction and use of American armed forces in the territories of these countries and their conversion into a military springboard of the U.S.A."

The situation in Persia In an article in NEW TIMES No.11 of 1959 entitled "A Shaky Throne" Y. Bochkaryov alleged that the Persian Government's conclusion of a military agreement with the U.S.A. was due to fear of its own people. The agreement, said Bochkaryov, spoke of U.S. assistance to Persia in the event of "any aggression"; but the "aggression" which the Persian rulers had in mind was an explosion of popular anger against their reactionary and oppressive regime. The argument of this article is not new (cf. MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.2, p.12); what is noteworthy is the vehemence of its condemnation of the Persian monarchy, Government and Mejlis, and the stark picture which it presents of oppression of the Persian masses by the landowners, the oil consortium, etc.

The Soviet-Sudanese trade agreement Under a Soviet-Sudanese trade agreement signed in Khartoum on 16th March the USSR will export to the Sudan machines and equipment, rolled ferrous metals, timber, sugar, cotton cloth, cement and other goods. The Sudan will export to the USSR cotton, groundnuts, sesame, dried fruits, gum arabic and other goods. Sudanese newspaper articles praising the agreement were quoted in the Soviet press.

Afro-Asian solidarity and the UAR At a session of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee in Moscow on 17th March, according to PRAVDA, speakers declared that aggravation of the relations between the UAR and Iraq "may do harm to the whole Afro-Asian solidarity movement".

Issued by Central Asian Research Centre
in association with
St. Antony's College (Oxford) Soviet Affairs Study Group.

# M I Z A N  N E W S L E T T E R

## APPENDIX

### Khrushchev's Address to the Iraqi Delegation on 16.3.59

The following is a translation of the address given by Khrushchev to the Iraqi Government economic delegation in the Kremlin on 16th March, as published in IZVESTIYA:

Esteemed Mr. Minister Ibrahim Kubbah, dear guests from the Iraqi Republic, Gentlemen, Comrades, it is a great pleasure for us to welcome here envoys of the courageous Iraqi people, who led by their national leader Abd al-Karim Qasim brought about a victorious revolution in July 1958. The revolution in Iraq and its further development are bringing the people of Iraq palpable results. The people have thrown off the chains of foreign colonizers and have begun to feel themselves freer in their own country.

For revolution means not only a change of members of this or that Government. If you change the people holding posts in the Government but preserve the former policy, foreign to the interests of the people, the people will quickly realize that this was not a revolution but simply an exchange of certain persons for others. And the people, naturally, will not cease their fight against a policy which is foreign to them.

A genuine revolution shakes the old, worn out foundations and breaks them, enabling the people to profit from the material and spiritual benefits of their labour and enabling the State to serve the interests of the people. A Government which conducts a policy in the interests of the people can always count on its support.

When the group of plotters a few days ago attempted to overthrow the Government led by Abd al-Karim Qasim, the people of Iraq supported their Government. The plotters were crushed and the black scheme of the reactionary forces suffered total defeat thanks to the resolution of the people to defend their national independence. The revolution in Iraq gained the support of all progressive forces because it was a big contribution towards the resolute struggle of the Arab peoples against the imperialist colonizers.

The revolution in Iraq was also greeted with great sympathy and encouragement in the United Arab Republic. I remember the first days

after the revolution had been accomplished. The President of the United Arab Republic Jamal Abd an-Nasir expressed the wish to meet me and exchange opinions, and a meeting took place between us in Moscow. The President and I had a detailed discussion and both rejoiced at the successes of the revolution in Iraq which had dealt a crushing blow to the plans of the imperialist colonizers. But gradually the attitude of Mr. Nasir towards the Iraqi revolution began to change. It is completely incomprehensible to us why this came about. For the measures which the Government of the Iraqi Republic carried through gave, and give, hope to the peoples that this Government really listens to the voice of its people and does everything possible for it under the conditions of the present development of the country's economy.

In this case how can President Nasir's change of attitude be explained? Obviously here his erroneous views on the subject of the union of the United Arab Republic with the Iraqi Republic have influenced him. President Nasir insists on the Union of the Iraqi Republic with the United Arab Republic.

It is clear that the problem of the union of States should be decided by the peoples of the countries concerned. They will decide themselves whether they should unite or keep their independent development, and whether they should or should not create a federation or confederation. The Soviet Union has not interfered and does not interfere in such affairs. But it is not a matter of indifference to us how a situation develops in a region not far from our frontiers, and we can express our attitude to the events which are taking place there.

In order successfully to conduct a fight for liberation from colonial oppression and to consolidate the victories of the peoples who have liberated themselves from it, and in order to achieve economic independence the united efforts of these peoples are necessary. However, this does not mean that countries who have broken the fetters of colonialism must obligatorily enter some union of States, obey the same Government, or follow one head or leader.

The union of several States into one State is a complex question. The experience of history shows that peoples, especially if they have recently freed themselves from foreign dependence, are very jealous of their sovereign rights and are extremely sensitive to any attempts to violate these rights. The union of States is only of advantage to the peoples when the necessary political and economic conditions are ripe for it and when all the characteristics of the uniting countries are taken into consideration. A union which is foisted upon a people and brought about against its will cannot be firm. Wisdom and patience must be shown in the resolving of such questions. If matters are decided in a hurry there may be undesirable consequences.

Premature union ultimately leads not to the consolidation but to the undermining of the unity of peoples. The people of one of the united countries begins to feel the loss of its independence more and more sharply and at the same time its former leaders either fade into the background or are thrown completely overboard because they are not agreed upon every point with the leaders of the united State. There takes place not a consolidation of unity but a disuniting of forces. To whom is this profitable? It is profitable only to the enemies of liberty; it is only profitable to the imperialists.

We express sincere regret that after the successful revolution in Iraq and its successful development relations have begun to develop between the Iraqi Republic and the United Arab Republic which do not promote union of the efforts of the Arab peoples in the struggle for their national independence, the development of the economy of their countries and the further raising of the standard of living of the peoples. Such relations are not to the advantage of the Arab peoples but to the advantage of the colonial powers who are interested in weakening the Arab States.

We express our regret about this especially because our people entertained and entertain a feeling of sincere friendship towards both the people of the Iraqi Republic and the peoples of the United Arab Republic. The Soviet people regarded the heroic struggle of the Egyptians with great sympathy and took the fate of the people of Egypt to its heart, when the colonizers attempted to seize the Suez Canal. Our country took every measure to stop the predatory war of the colonizers against Egypt in order to help her to defend her independence.

The heroic people of Egypt under the leadership of their government headed by Jamal Abd an-Nasir exhibited willpower and courage in the struggle with the invaders, and defended their country. The positive role of President Nasir in this struggle has often been remarked upon by us.

It is also well known that the Soviet people helped to avert the serious threat hanging over Syria in connection with the imperialist plot against her, and this was widely appreciated by the Arab peoples.

In the interests of the further development of the Arab States, their struggle for final liberation from colonial dependence and for the consolidation of their economy there must be a strengthening of Arab solidarity and the unity of the peoples of Arab countries against imperialist intrigues. And we hope that sense will gain the upper hand and everything will be done to abolish this conflict and not allow the imperialists to use it in their own interests. Questions of internal development are the business of the peoples of each State. It must be admitted that we are all grieved by the recent speeches of President Nasir in Damascus. When he speaks of communism and communists in these speeches he arms himself with the tongue of the imperialists.

Attacks on communism are not new. What Mr. Nasir said about communism has already been said a long time ago by reactionaries in various countries. Mr. Nasir has not yet used everything from the arsenal of the enemies of communism. He has large reserves at his disposal if he wants to follow this path.

The history of the struggle with communism covers more than a hundred years. And in our country the Tsar and his satraps conducted a struggle with communism during which, if in a booklet or paper such a popular expression for example as "putting the pies in the open (literally, free) air" was found, even this was seen to be seditious and such words were struck out. Communists are called the agents of foreign States. But allow me then to ask: to the agents of what country would you assign the communists of the Soviet Union? Whose agents are we? If the communists are to be called agents then we are the agents of the working class of the Soviet Union, the labouring people of the Soviet Union, and we serve them faithfully. Communists everywhere are the true sons of their peoples.

Calling the communists agents of foreign countries is not a new gambit. When after the February revolution Vladimir Il'ich Lenin returned to Russia from abroad the reactionaries called him a German agent. Enemies resorted to such base slander that even Lenin, and together with him all the Bolsheviks, were called German agents. And what happened in fact? The people did not believe this slander. The Bolsheviks, who are the best spokesmen for the interests of the workers, the working peaseatry and all the labourers of our country, brought the Soviet people to the greatest victories of socialism. Our country has come out into the wide open space of free development. We have created the most advanced and powerful State with a highly developed economy and culture. President Nasir had the opportunity of personally familiarizing himself with our country, convincing himself of its victories and correctly appreciating the prospects for the development of the Soviet State. All this has been done under the leadership of the communists, on communist principles. Many of those who once opposed communism have long ago been rejected by the peoples and consigned to oblivion. If they are sometimes remembered it is only as reactionaries who brought unhappiness to their peoples. I am convinced therefore that the ungrateful role of fighter against communism will bring Mr. Nasir no laurels, although it may bring him for a certain time the favour of certain circles in the imperialist States.

It may be asked what now will be the Soviet Union's relations with the United Arab Republic? I think that they will be the same as hitherto. For when we formed friendly relations with the UAR we knew about the anti-communist views of President Nasir. It is true, we thought that during the course of the national liberation struggle, demanding the union of all anti-imperialist forces, more forbearance and more attention to the democratic demands of the people would be shown. Unfortunately at present, on the contrary, measures are being taken to suppress freedom-

loving aspirations not only in the United Arab Republic but even in other countries. We want to say, in a friendly way, that such a policy, if persisted in, will inevitably fail. It is said that Arab nationalism supposedly stands outside the interests of separate Arab States, and outside the interests of different classes of the population of Arab countries. Undoubtedly the interests of the majority of Arabs are indivisible in the struggle against the colonial yoke. But after a country has freed itself from foreign domination the interests of the people cannot be ignored. The interests of all the Arabs cannot coincide. Therefore attempts under the flag of nationalism to ignore the interests of separate classes of the population and the interests of the working people are futile.

Certainly what is taking place in the Iraqi Republic is in no way socialism. But then we never conducted our relations with Arab countries on this basis. However, we consider that progressive reforms are being carried out in the Iraqi Republic and a more advanced system is being established than in neighbouring countries of the Arab East. It is natural that our sympathies should be on the side of those Governments and those States which take into consideration the interests of their people.

We warmly greet the Prime Minister of Iraq Abd al-Karim Qasim who is courageously leading his country along the path of progress, the path of consolidating the young Iraqi Republic, and we wish him and his Government new successes.

We regard the activities of the Iraqi Government, directed to raising the national economy of the country and the prosperity of its people, with great attention and sincere sympathy. We hope that the Soviet-Iraqi agreement signed today on economical and technical co-operation will help these goals to be attained. The agreement provides for the construction in Iraq of metallurgical, machine-construction and chemical factories, factories for food and other light industry, irrigation constructions and other projects with technical co-operation. In a brotherly way we shall help the Iraqi people more quickly to abolish the burdensome consequences of colonialism. Our economic and technical aid to Iraq is friendly and disinterested; it entails no political, military or other conditions.

We have given such aid to Egypt and Syria and we are now giving it to the United Arab Republic. We are giving such help to other countries as well. We have fulfilled and shall honourably fulfill the obligations that we have taken upon ourselves. And we are prepared in the future to extend our economic ties and to do everything in our power to help the Iraqi people, the Iraqi State and other countries which have freed themselves from colonialism.

The construction of factories, irrigation constructions, railways and other important economic projects planned by the Government of Iraq is an important step along the path to abolishing the economic backwardness of the country. All this also means occupation for tens of thousands of working hands and the supply of cheaper goods and provisions to the population of the country.

Before your Government and before the people of Iraq stands the hard but noble task of transforming your country, as you were telling us, from a backward colonial country into the advanced country of the Middle East. You have all the necessary conditions for this. The wonderful, industrious Iraqi people has made a big contribution to the treasure=house of world culture and civilization. The history of Iraq is rich in the glorious traditions of the fight for national independence. Your country possesses enormous and varied natural resources. You have true and disinterested friends ready to come to your help and co-operate with you in overcoming difficulties. And we do not doubt that the freedom-loving Iraqi people will overcome all obstacles and will accomplish the great tasks confronting the Iraqi Republic.

Allow me to propose a toast to the firm friendship between the Soviet and Iraqi peoples! To the Health of Prime Minister Abd al-Karim Qasim and the members of his Government! To our dear guests! To peace in the whole world!

Issued by Central Asian Research Centre
in association with
St. Antony's College (Oxford) Soviet Affairs Study Group.